|   | Application No.  | Applicant(s)   |
|---|--|--|
| Notice of Allowability  | 09/904,045   | BUTCHER ET AL.   |
|   | Examiner   | Art Unit   |
|   | Mary (Molly) E. Ceperley   | 1641   |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appeal All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIOF of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313  | (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in thi<br>or other appropriate communic<br>IGHTS. This application is subj | s application. If not included ation will be mailed in due course. <b>THIS</b> |
| 1. 🖂 This communication is responsive to the amendment filed  | July 02, 2004.   |  |
| 2. $\boxtimes$ The allowed claim(s) is/are $\underline{5,7,9,10,12,14-20,22,24,26}$ and   | <u>d 27</u> .  |  |
| 3.   The drawings filed on are accepted by the Examine  | r.   |  |
| <ul> <li>4. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority ur</li> <li>a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of the:</li> <li>1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have</li> </ul>   |  | <b>).</b>  |
| 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have  |  | ο.   |
| Copies of the certified copies of the priority document of the pri | ,  |  |
| Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONN THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.  5. A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be subm INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which give  | IENT of this application.  itted. Note the attached EXAMII as reason(s) why the oath or de     | NER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF   |
| 6. CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") mus   |  |  |
| (a) including changes required by the Notice of Draftspers  | · ·  | PTO-948) attached  |
| 1) hereto or 2) to Paper No./Mail Date  |  | h. Office and a st   |
| (b)  including changes required by the attached Examiner's<br>Paper No./Mail Date   | s Amenament / Comment or in t  | ne Office action of  |
| Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1 each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the  |  |  |
| 7. DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the depo-<br>attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT   |  |  |
| Attachment(a)   | 2  |  |
| Attachment(s) 1. ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 5. Notice of Inform  | nal Patent Application (PTO-152)   |
| 2.  Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 6. Interview Summ  |  |
| 3. Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No./Mail Date  | Paper No./Mai<br>18), 7. ⊠ Examiner's Am   | I Date<br>endment/Comment  |
| 4.   Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit   | <u> </u>   | tement of Reasons for Allowance  |
| of Biological Material  | 9. ☐ Other   | Mary & Coperacy  MARY E. CEPERLEY  PRIMARY EXAMINER                            |
|   |  | AU 1641  |

Application/Control Number: 09/904,045

Art Unit: 1641

1) The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The claims are now limited to the use of "a membrane containing the  $I_{Kr}$  channel, derived from a cell line transfected with the human ERG gene". As stated by applicants in the fifth paragraph of the Remarks filed July 02, 2004, the Chadwick et al, Fiset et al, Geonzon et al, and Duff et al references do not describe or suggest a binding assay using membranes from cells expressing human ERG as the source of the ion channel. See also: page one of the instant specification, lines 18-20: "the current binding assay has also been developed using membranes from cells expressing hERG rather than ERG in intact animal cells, as the source of the ion channel" (emphasis added); Example 3 B. Membranes (specification, page 21). Spector et al {Circulation Research; March 1996; 78(3), pp. 499-503} further establish that differences in the  $I_{Kr}$  blocking of Class III antiarrythmic drugs in in vitro testing may be due to variables such as differences in channel characteristics (HERG versus guinea pig and mouse  $I_{Kr}$ ), tissue types (oocytes versus myocytes) or the specific drugs tested. Given the state of the art as described above, the prior art is considered neither to describe nor fairly suggest the claimed test for the characterization of a compound as an  $I_{Kr}$  channel blocker which comprises the use of the combination of a particular  $^{35}S$  labeled compound of formula I and a membrane containing the  $I_{Kr}$  channel derived from a cell line transfected with the human ERG gene.

- 2) Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee.Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."
- *3)* Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mary (Molly) E. Ceperley whose telephone number is (571) 272-0813. The examiner can normally be reached from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

Application/Control Number: 09/904,045

Art Unit: 1641

Page 3

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long V. Le, can be reached on (571) 272-0823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

September 07, 2004

Mary E. Ceperley
Mary (Molly) E. Ceperley
Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1641